



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/554,604	05/31/2000	Andrew J. Dannenberg	CRF D-2165	9421

7590

06/21/2002

Eric S Spector  
Jones Tullar & Cooper  
PO Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER
----------

WANG, SHENGJUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Applicati n No.

09/554,604

Applicant(s)

DANNENBERG, ANDREW J.

Examiner

Shengjun Wang

Art Unit

1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☒ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☒ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: None.Claim(s) rejected: 3-5 and 17.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7 and 9-11.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

  
RUSSELL TRAVERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the final rejection. The argument that primary biliary cirrhosis and hepatitis are distinct and therefore method for treating biliary cirrhosis would not be obvious for treating hepatitis is not probative. It should be known in the art that biliary cirrhosis often associated with liver disorder, e.g., enlarged liver.. See Merck Manual(15th edition), page 855-856. Further, COX-2 is known for treating inflammatory disease and hepatitis is an inflammatory disease. The argument that hepatotoxicity of NSAIDs would make the claimed invention nonobvious is not persuasive in view of Gregory's teaching. Gregory teach expressly using COX-2 inhibitor for treating liver disease. (See the final rejection). Gregory also state using COX-2 inhibitor would avoid the side effect introduced by common NSAIDs. See column 6, line 39-49. It is well known that COX-2 inhibitor more effectively reduce inflammation and produce fewer and less drastic side effect. (Tally, column 1, lines 28-36. The exhibits have considered, but there are not persuasive in providing evidence showing, at the time the claimed invention was made, nonobviousness of claimed invention.

Continuation of 10. Other: The proposed amendments are identical as presented in paper No. 11, which have already been entered. See, the advisory action mailed May 1, 2002, paper No. 12.